

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's careful consideration of their application and respectfully request reconsideration followed by allowance.

Amended claim 1 includes units for density (d) based on the specification at page 5, lines 18-24.

A blown film of the present invention has:

(a) sufficient strength (tear strength), because surface layers thereof contain no linear low-density polyethylene, although middle layer(s) may contain low-density polyethylene, and

(b) high transparency (haze), because a crystallization temperature of linear low-density polyethylene 2 used for middle layer(s) thereof is higher by at least 2°C than that of linear low-density polyethylene 1 used for surface layers thereof.

Applicants respectfully suggest there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Suzuki et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,274,691 B1) in view of Brambilla (U.S. Patent No. 5,916,692).

Applicants submit there would have been no reason to combine the two references, and even if combined it is submitted a person of only ordinary skill in the art would have had no expectation of accomplishing the inventions described in this application.

The Suzuki document may not be prior art, see 35 U.S.C. §103(c), although there may be early published non-U.S. counterparts. Nonetheless, even if the Suzuki document (or a published foreign counterpart) is prior art, it would not have suggested the present inventions, even if it would have been combined with the Brambilla reference.

The Suzuki document does not disclose a three layer structure of a multilayer film having a middle layer made of a blend of a linear low density polyethylene and low density polyethylene. Office Action, pages 2-3.

The Suzuki document neither discloses nor would it have suggested the density and crystallization temperatures for polymers used for a blown film as described in this application.

The Suzuki document does disclose an improvement in transparency (column 4, lines 35-40), but that would greatly decrease strength (e.g., tear strength). It would therefore appear Suzuki reference does not disclose concurrent improvement in both transparency and strength (tear strength).


It is also not seen where the Suzuki document inherently discloses characteristics and properties of a layer or layers that the Office Action states are themselves not described in the document. An Examiner's Declaration seems to be in order.

It is also not seen where the secondary reference would have commended its combination with the Suzuki document, except with the benefit of hindsight, motivated an ordinary skilled worker to modify the Suzuki reference to achieve the inventions of this application.

Applicants earnestly, but respectfully, solicit a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

By: 
Kendrew H. Colton
Registration No. 30,368

Fitch, Even, Tabin & Flannery
1801 K Street, N.W. - Suite 401L
Washington, D.C. 20006-1201
Telephone No. (202) 419-7000
Facsimile No. (202) 419-7007